



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,119	07/31/2003	Robert J. Mauceri JR.	13768.810.52	2462
47973 7590 08/20/2007 WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			EXAMINER LUDWIG, MATTHEW J	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/631,119	MAUCERI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew J. Ludwig	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23-30, 35 and 36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 31-34 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the Request for Continued Examination received 6/8/07.
2. Claims 23-36 are pending in the application. Claims 23 and 36 are independent claims.
3. Claims 23-36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rempell in view of Teague have been withdrawn pursuant to applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claims 23 and 36 recite the limitation "the visual properties". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
7. **Claims 23-30, 35, and 36, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayton et al., USPN 7,051,084 filed (11/2/00).**

In reference to independent claim 23, 35, and 36, Hayton teaches:

The code fragment identified as 'main' represents all of the header information and the static information of the web page. The code fragment identified as 'do table' represents the part

Art Unit: 2178

of the page generation code that creates a table on the web page. The code fragment identified as 'do share' represents the process that creates an individual element of the table (compare to "displaying a decorative panel by displaying elements in a software table, the software table including a plurality of cells, according to attributes specified for visually related regions of the decorative panel such that elements displayed in cells..."). See page 8, lines 9-67 and page 11, lines 1-67. The reference teaches a page with related regions. Figure 2b illustrates an example of the correspondences between page portions of the web page and the code fragments that generate the page portions. Examples of format for the web page and thus of the page portions include HTML. The reference fails to explicitly state decorative panels, however, the specification defines a decorative panel as a plurality of separate but visually related regions that are defined by the table elements. Therefore, the separate but related page portions as taught by Hayton suggest a similar means of creating a decorative panel. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Hayton reference and utilized the well-known page portions to create a decorative panel and display the page portions using HTML/code fragments which would have given the user a dynamic page for multimedia presentations.

All of the page portions of the page that can change are located in the body of the page as represented by the 'do table' code fragment and the 'do share' code fragment (compare to "receiving user input specifying a change in the appearance of the visual properties of the decorative panel"). See page 9, lines 1-43 and page 13, lines 24-49.

The value field represents a portion of the page that the execution of a code fragment generates. In one embodiment, the data in the value field is the HTML output that is used to

Art Unit: 2178

generate that portion of the page on the display of the client node. The map of correspondences maps the value field to those nodes in the node tree that correspond to that specific value field (compare to “mapping changes in the appearance of the visual properties of the decorative panel to cells in the software table”). See column 14, lines 45-67 and page 15, lines 1-67.

Figures 11-11d illustrate an example of the display alter method incorporating an update into the displayed page. The portion of the page that the display alter method is updating a table, identified as the node with the identification tag “1”. The table is being updated by adding a new element to the table (compare to “automatically revising attributes of the cells, without a user needing to manipulate individual cells, to correspond to the changes in the appearance of the visual properties of the decorative panel”). See page 20, lines 43-67 and page 21, lines 1-45.

In reference to dependent claim 24, Hayton teaches:

The client node can be any computing device used to provide a user interface to an application or web page, or to otherwise present data stored or accessed via the server node. See column 5, lines 1-27.

In reference to dependent claim 25, Hayton teaches:

The page generation code includes a plurality of code fragments that generate the corresponding page portions. See column 6, lines 10-45.

In reference to dependent claim 26, Hayton teaches:

All of the page portions of the page that can change are located in the “body” of the page as represented by the ‘do table’ code fragment and the ‘do share’ code fragment. See column 9, lines 5-34.

In reference to dependent claim 27, Hayton teaches:

The code fragment identified as 'main' represents all of the header information and the static information of the web page. The code fragment identified as 'do table' represents the part of the page generation code that creates a table on the web page. The code fragment identified as 'do share' represents the process that creates an individual element of the table. See page 8, lines 9-67 and page 11, lines 1-67.

In reference to dependent claim 28 and 29, Hayton teaches:

If the page generation code does not include a body page portion, the 'main' code fragment includes additional code similar to the other wrapped code fragments. The additional code provides an identification tag for the 'body' part of the 'main' code fragment. See column 9, lines 1-34.

In reference to dependent claim 30, Hayton teaches:

All of the page portions of the page that can change are located in the body of the page as represented by the 'do table' code fragment and the 'do share' code fragment (compare to "receiving user input specifying a change in the appearance of the visual properties of the decorative panel"). See page 9, lines 1-43 and page 13, lines 24-49.

The value field represents a portion of the page that the execution of a code fragment generates. In one embodiment, the data in the value field is the HTML output that is used to generate that portion of the page on the display of the client node. The map of correspondences maps the value field to those nodes in the node tree that correspond to that specific value field. See column 14, lines 45-67 and page 15, lines 1-67.

Art Unit: 2178

In reference to dependent claim 33, Hayton teaches:

Figure 1 illustrates an exemplary embodiment of a process by which the display alterer incorporates the updates for portions of the page that have changed, using the modifications list that the server node transmitted along with the updated page portions. See column 20, lines 6-60.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 31, 32, 33, and 34, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 23-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion


10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 571-272-4127. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ML


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER